

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 11-18 are currently amended in the present amendment, claim 10 is canceled and new claims 19-25 are added in the present amendment.

Applicant has amended the specification by adding a reference to the prior U.S. provisional application in the first paragraph of the specification.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure, because he states the recitation on page 1, line 9 "almost any file one downloads . . ." should have been --almost any file *once* downloads . . . -- The Examiner is incorrect. The recitation is correct as written. The word "one" is intended to mean "a person." Therefore, no correction is necessary.

Claims 1-5 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,733 to Nakano et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Nakano et al. reference is a network archiver system for storing data files into an archiver (library) arranged on a network to which a plurality of computers are connected and referring to such data files. The network archiver system disclosed in the Nakano et al reference also provides the ability to compress the data files into an archiver, reconstruct the compressed data files, and refer to such data files. The terms "archive" or "archiver" as used in the Nakano et al. reference are generally used to mean areas or locations where compressed files of a computer network are stored. There is no teaching or suggestion of managing or manipulating these files, such as disclosed and claimed in the present invention.

In contrast, the present invention is a software utility program that is integrated into A file browser for managing and manipulating archive files within the A file browser environment. The term "archive" in the present invention is used to mean compressed files. "Archive" is a commonly used term for files in the zip file format, sometimes referred to as zip archives. The Nakano et al. reference is thus very different from the present invention.

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that the Nakano et al. reference discloses "a user interface" as a protocol interface disclosed in Fig. 7, component 32. The TCP/IP layer protocol interface 32 is provided as an interface for the network 10 of the host 24 and clients 26-1 and 26-2, such as a socket interface. This is not the same as or equivalent to "a user interface," such as a graphical user interface as disclosed and claimed in the present invention. Further, the Examiner states that Nakano et al. discloses the claimed feature "a file manager including the central directory interfacing with archive files and data object files" in the Abstract and in col. 8, lines 41-51. The Nankano et al. reference discloses an archiver managing module for managing the archiver on the network. Again, this is different from the file manager of the present invention, which allows for opening, viewing and modifying archive files; extracting and adding data to archive files; and creating new archive files. The Examiner also states that Nakano et al. discloses the claimed feature of "a compression/extraction engine interfacing with the file manager for compressing, extracting, encrypting archive files and data object files" as a compression module disclosed in Fig. 4, component 21 of Nakano et al. However, the compression module disclosed in the Nakano et al. reference does not provide for extracting, authenticating, encrypting or decrypting archive files as claimed in claim 1 of the present invention.

The Nakano et al. reference does not teach or suggest the network archiver system being integrated into a file browser. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to integrate the network archiver system of Nakano et al. into a file browser, because the invention disclosed in Nakano et al. is not designed to work with a file browser. The Nakano et al. reference is related to the sharing of information over a network and not related to the managing and manipulating of compressed archive files that is well suited for implementation in a file browser. There is no motivation to combine the Nakano et al. reference with a file browser. In fact, the combination would be non-operative.

Applicant believes that amended claim 1 contains patentable subject matter and is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn in light of the above amendments and remarks.

Claims 2-5 are dependent claims that dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to include accessing a software utility program integrated into a file browser for managing and manipulating archive files within the file browser environment by using the browser's modified menus, toolbars, and/or drag and drop operators. As mentioned above, the Nakano et al. reference does not teach or suggest a software utility program integrated into a file browser for managing and manipulating archive files within the browser environment. The invention of the Nakano et al. reference is very different from the present invention and is not designed to be implemented into a file browser.

Claims 13-17 are dependent claims that dependent upon independent claim 12, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-5 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn in light of the amendments and remarks. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 12-17 should now be in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al., in view of Japanese Patent No. 9-223052. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Nakano et al. reference fails to disclose "a mail attachment compressor module for automatically compressing email attachments" as recited in claims 6. However, the Japanese reference discloses an electronic mail apparatus comprising among other things, a compression table with an identifier for indicating the format of the email's attached file, wherein the identifier is used for selecting the appropriate compression program from the compression table for compressing the attachment, and wherein the compressed attachment and a decompression program are attached to the email being transmitted. The Japanese reference transmits a decompression program with the compressed attachment.

The combination of claims 1 with 6-11 and 12 with 18 are not taught or suggested by the combination of Nakano et al. with Japanese Patent No. 9-223052. There is no motivation to combine the cited references and the combination would be non-operative, since the computer systems and functions of the two inventions are so different. In addition, the present invention

does not include attaching a decompression algorithm along with the compressed email attachment as disclosed in the Japanese patent reference.

Claims 6-11 are dependent claims, dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Claim 18 is a dependent claim, dependent upon independent claim 12, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements it contains.

None of the cited prior art references, whether taken singly or in combination with another, teach or suggest applicant's claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn in light of the above amendments and remarks. Therefore, claims 1-18 should now be in condition for allowance.

New claims 19-25 are included to further define the invention and recite elements not in the original set of claims. In particular, claim 19 recites the archive files as being zip files. Claim 20 recites a mail attachment compressor module for automatically archiving and compressing email attachments. Claim 21 recites the system being integrated into the file browser using a shell name space extension application program interface developed by Microsoft and accessed by the browser menus, toolbars, and/or drag and drop operators. Claim 22 recites an Internet plug-in module integrated into an Internet browser for managing and manipulate archive files downloaded from the Internet. Claim 23 recites the mail attachment compressor module providing encryption of attachments as they are sent.

Claims 19-23 are dependent claims that dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

New claim 24 recites a system for compressing email attachments comprising a mail attachment compressor module integrated into a mail program having a compression/extraction engine for automatically compressing email attachments into zip files as the emails are sent. Claim 25 further recites the compression/extraction engine providing parameters for configuration of digital certificate based file authentication, encryption and compression method options of the email attachments. Clearly, the Japanese patent reference does not teach or suggest a mail attachment compressor module integrated into a mail program for automatically compressing email attachments into zip files as the emails are sent and providing parameters for configuration of digital certificate based file authentication, encryption and compression method options of the email attachments.

Applicant believes that new claims 19-25 contain patentable subject matter and are in condition for allowance.

In view of the amendments and remarks presented above, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims. No new matter has been added to the application. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned in the event a telephone conference would be helpful in advancing prosecution of the application.

Application No. 09/803,355
Amendment dated September 25, 2003
Reply to Office Action mailed April 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: 09/25/2003

By: William K. Baxter
William K. Baxter
Reg. No. 41,606

Attorneys of Record for Applicant
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590
Telephone: 414-273-3500
Facsimile: 414-273-5198
Email: wbaxter@gklaw.com

MW750142_1.DOC